



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/668,282

09/24/2003

Iwata Ikeda

64484-013

3504

7590 04/14/2011  
McDermott, Will & Emery  
600 13th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

DULANEY, BENJAMIN O

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/14/2011

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/668,282	<b>Applicant(s)</b> IKEDA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> BENJAMIN O. DULANEY	<b>Art Unit</b> 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-10 and 13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-10 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)         | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments, see page 10, filed 1/26/11, with respect to claim 13 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claim 13 has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments filed 1/26/11 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding applicant's argument for claim 1 that Hansen does not teach rules that affect the creation of a workflow, examiner disagrees. The workflow (i.e. job tickets) of Hansen include output apparatus information (as taught in column 18, lines 29-45) that attempts to match job attributes with an output device. This matching in creation of a job ticket to send data to a specific apparatus is then subject to the rules (i.e. "policies" of Hansen) taught in column 18, lines 46-64 which can greatly affect the choice of output device. Therefore, Hansen certainly teaches that the policies affect the choice of output device, which is part of the job ticket, thereby teaching policies that affect the job ticket and overcoming the current argument.

Additional features to the claims are taught as detailed below utilizing the additional reference U.S. patent 6,509,903 by Yosefi.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 1) Claims 1, 5-10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,509,974 by Hansen, and further in view of U.S. patent 6,509,903 by Yosefi.
- 2) Regarding claims 1, 10 and 13, Hansen teaches an apparatus for generating a workflow for making image recording media recorded with images expressed by page data from the page data described in page description language, comprising: a designator for designating attributes of the image recording media constituting finally resulting matter resulting due to processing based on the workflow to be created (column 6, lines 20-60; figures 2 and 4; specifically lines 55-60 detailing attribute selection); and a workflow creator for creating the workflow by deciding upon processes required in order to make the image recording media and parameter values for the required processes based on attributes designated by the designator (column 11, line 64 - column 12, line 2; figures 2 and 4; the "tickets" which control the workflow operation can be interpreted as the workflow itself): and a ticket creator for creating a job ticket indicating content of processes required to make the image recording media based on the workflow created by the workflow creator (column 4, lines 46-51; figures 2 and 4); a display having a prescribed screen (figure 4); a pointing device operated by a user for designating positions of the screen (column 8, lines 64-65); and a display controller

Art Unit: 2625

(column 3, line 22; display program detailed by Hansen is for use on PCs 114 and 116, for example, that have inherent controllers to be able to display GUI's such as figure 4), wherein the workflow creator comprises: a rule storage unit for storing rules, bringing processes required to construct the workflow and parameter values for the processes into correspondence with each attribute selectable for the image recording media, for creating the workflow for making the image recording media, in advance (column 18, lines 51-56; figures 2 and 4; in example cited in Hansen the processes would be the selection/printing of the particular resource, and the "parameter values" would include whatever standard values the special attributes would inherently have to be converted to for the job to be printed on the particular chosen resource); an environmental information storage unit for storing in advance environmental information indicating an environment relating to each processor module for executing each process capable of being selected for making the image recording media (column 18, lines 46-51; a capability that is not available on the printers or a queue that is too big is "environment information" as defined by applicant's specification); and a process content decider for deciding upon a processor module required to make the image recording media and parameter values for the required processor modules based on attributes designated by the designator by referring to the rules and the environmental information based on the attributes designated by the designator (column 18, lines 45-53; "resource allocator" is the process content decider); the display controller displays a plurality of icons indicating the respective attributes selectable for the image recording media constituting the finally resulting matter at the display (column 8, lines 59-62 states that "GUI

Art Unit: 2625

interface, documents, tickets **and other entities and operations** are visually represented ... such as with icons”, thereby establishing that any visual interactions with the display can take place through the use of icons and could be applied to the attribute selection detailed in column 6, lines 55-60 and column 12, lines 1-4); the designator registers an attribute indicated by a selected icon as an output requirement when one of the plurality of icons is selected due to an operation of the pointing device (column 12, lines 1-16; global and job level attributes can be registered; point and click can be used for selection as previously noted in column 8, lines 64-65); the workflow creator creates a workflow based on attributes registered as output requirements (column 11, line 64-column 12, line 2; workflow is the sum of parameters and attributes of a job); the attributes designated as attributes of the image recording media by the designator include at least one of the type of image recording media to be made as the finally resulting matter, number of items, size, variety of colors, presence or absence of a trap, and imposition method (column 12, line 3 teaches at least the type of recoding media); the rules stored in the rule storage unit include a rule executed when output is to paper (column 18, lines 46-64 teaches that any “special attribute” can have a rule defined for it, an attribute such as color of paper taught in column 16, lines 61-62), a rule executed when page size and paper size are designated as the output requirement (column 17, line 59 teaches page/paper size attribute which can be subject to a rule), and a rule when a special color is set as the output requirement (column 16, lines 61-62 teaches blue paper which can be subject to a rule); and when the workflow creator creates a

Art Unit: 2625

workflow, the display controller displays the created workflow at the display (figure 4; column 12, lines 56-62).

Hansen does not specifically teach a rule is executed when a trap is set as the output requirement.

Yosefi teaches a rule is executed when a trap is set as the output requirement (column 2, lines 14-19; trapping is performed based upon analyses of the workflow [i.e. rules]).

Hansen and Yosefi are combinable because they are both from the printing field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hansen with Yosefi to add trapping as an output requirement. The motivation for doing so would have been “to compensate for imperfections of the printing press” (column 1, line 15). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Hansen with Yosefi to obtain the invention of claims 1, 10 and 13.

3) Regarding claim 5, Hansen teaches the apparatus of claim 1, wherein: the display controller displays a first area displaying a plurality of icons indicating the respective selectable attributes (figure 4, item 302), a second area displaying icons indicating attributes registered as output requirements (figure 4, item 306), and a third area displaying the created workflow in a distinguishable manner at the screen (figure 4, item 306); and when one of the icons displayed at the first area is dragged and dropped to the second area by the pointing device, the designator registers the attribute

Art Unit: 2625

indicated by the dragged and dropped icon as an output requirement (column 16, lines 53-65).

4) Regarding claim 6, Hansen teaches the apparatus of claim 5, wherein: when one of the icons registered as an output requirement displayed in the second area is clicked using the pointing device, the display controller separately displays an operation screen for setting detailed content for the attribute indicated by the clicked icon at the display, and the designator registers detailed content set based on user operations of the separately displayed operation screen as output requirements (column 10, lines 23-38).

Hansen does not specifically teach double-clicking.

Examiner's official notice in a previous action has gone unchallenged and therefore double clicking is considered well known.

5) Regarding claim 7, Hansen teaches the apparatus of claim 1, wherein when one of the plurality of icons indicating the respective selectable attributes is clicked by the pointing device, the designator registers the attribute indicated by the clicked icon as output requirements (column 10, lines 23-38).

Hansen does not specifically teach double-clicking.

Examiner's official notice in a previous action has gone unchallenged and therefore double clicking is considered well known.

6) Regarding claim 8, Hansen teaches a printing and prepressing manufacturing system comprising the apparatus of claim 1 and further comprising an executor for executing processing on the page data based on the workflow created by the workflow



Art Unit: 2625

creator so as to make the image recording media with attributes designated by the designator (column 12, lines 31-46).

7) Regarding claim 9, Hansen teaches a printing and prepressing manufacturing system comprising the apparatus of claim 1 and further comprising: a ticket storage unit for storing tickets generated by the ticket creator (figure 2, item 204), and an executor for issuing tickets saved at the ticket storage unit when new page data is obtained and executing processing of the content indicated by the issued ticket on the new page data so that the image recording media having attributes designated by the designator is made (column 4, lines 46-51).

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2625

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BENJAMIN O. DULANEY whose telephone number is (571)272-2874. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (10am - 6pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sudhanshu Pathak can be reached on (571)272-5509. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Benjamin O Dulaney/

Examiner, Art Unit 2625

Application/Control Number: 10/668,282

Page 10

Art Unit: 2625

/Sudhanshu C Pathak/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625